

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed April 12, 2007 considered claims 1-27. Claims 1-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by "Slennox's eggdrop page"; hereinafter *Slennox* in view of U.S. "BotnetCentral – Your source for Eggdrop related Stuff"; hereinafter *BotnetCentral*.¹

By this amendment claims 1, 12, 21, 26 and 27 have been amended.² Claims 1-27 are pending, of which claims 1, 10-12, 21, 26 and 27 are the only independent claims at issue.

The present invention is generally directed to including a software resource as a member of the group of chat participants within an online chat session conducted through a messaging service. For example, claim 1 recites registering the software resource to indicate that it is available to participate in an online chat session, when said software resource is executed. Next, claim 1 recites including the software resource, along with the plurality of computer users, as members in a group of online chat participants, each member in the group of chat participants, including the software resource, capable of sending a plain language message relating to the specified subject being discussed to all the other members in the group of chat participants, including the software resource. Next, claim 1 recites receiving from a member of the group of chat participants a submission of a plain language message related to the specified subject being discussed.

Next, claim 1 recites transmitting the plain language message to each member of the group of online chat participants, including the software resource. Next, claim 1 recites parsing the plain language message to generate a query for data related to the specified subject being discussed. Next, claim 1 recites submitting the generated query to at least one database to obtain data specific to the subject being discussed. Next, claim 1 recites receiving a response to the query from at least one of the at least one databases. Next, claim 1 recites determining a plain language response to the message based on the received database response, the plain language response being related to the subject being discussed. Lastly, claim 1 recites transmitting the plain language response back to all of the members of the group of chat participants, including

¹ Although the prior art status of the cited art is not being challenged at this time, Applicant reserves the right to challenge the prior art status of the cited art at any appropriate time, should it arise. Accordingly, any arguments and amendments made herein should not be construed as acquiescing to any prior art status of the cited art.

² Support for the amendments to the claims are found throughout the specification and previously presented claims, including but not limited to paragraphs [0008], [0036]-[0038], [0040], [0042], [0043], [0048] and Figures 3, 5 & 6.

the member that submitted the plain language message and including at least one other member that did not submit the plain language message, thus enabling each member of the group of chat participants to equally interact with the software resource as another participant in the online chat session, by responding to the plain language message relating to the specified subject being discussed.

Claims 10 and 11 are computer program product claims corresponding to performing different portions of claim 1. Claims 12 is a method claim similar from claim 1, from the perspective of a messaging program. Claim 21 is a system claim corresponding to claim 1. Claim 26 is an apparatus claim corresponding to claim 1. Claim 27 is an apparatus claim corresponding to claim 12.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited art of record does not anticipate or otherwise render the amended claims unpatentable for at least the reason that the cited art does not disclose, suggest, or enable each and every element of these claims.

Slennox describes an internet relay chat (IRC) bot known as "Eggdrop" that provides advanced IRC channel management and flexibility for adding scripts and other bots (see "What is an Eggdrop?" lines 24-29). Eggdrop bots typically sit in an IRC channel appearing like a regular user. The bots usually remain idle until called upon to perform a particular function (e.g. add or kick a user, prevent spam and maintaining the channel op-list (list of operators that have privileges to interact with and control the bot) (see "What is an Eggdrop" lines 3-6). An operator can input commands into Eggdrop via a chat interface (usually direct client-to-client (DCC)) using a "." before each command. However, regular, non-operator users are not permitted to interact with or control the bot (see "Using your Eggdrop" lines 14-17). Furthermore, when an operator is sending commands to an Eggdrop bot, other users in the same chat room do not receive replies from the bot – only the operator receives replies from the bot. Along those same lines, when an operator sends a command or inquiry to the Eggdrop bot, chat room users do not see the command/inquiry nor do they respond to it.

BotnetCentral teaches allowing an Eggdrop administrator to set up a command to which the Eggdrop bot will respond. *BotnetCentral* teaches using the !trigger command to perform a user-specified action. For example, the user can specify that, upon receiving the !trigger command, the Eggdrop bot should send a notice to (username), send a private message to

(username) and/or send a public message to (channelname). The administrator can also specify who among the Eggdrop users has access to this command.

However, neither *Slennox* nor *BotnetCentral* teaches or suggests the software resource parsing the plain language message to generate a query for data related to the specified subject being discussed, as recited in claim 1. Furthermore, neither *Slennox* nor *BotnetCentral* teaches or suggests the software resource submitting the generated query to at least one database to obtain data specific to the subject being discussed, as recited in claim 1. At least for either of these reasons, claim 1 patentably defines over the art of record. At least for either of these reasons, claims 10-12, 21, 26 and 27 also patentably define over the art of record. Since each of the dependent claims depend from one of claims 10-12, 21, 26 and 27, each of the dependent claims also patentably define over the art of record for at least either of the same reasons.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the other rejections to the claims are now moot and do not, therefore, need to be addressed individually at this time. It will be appreciated, however, that this should not be construed as Applicant acquiescing to any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action regarding the cited art or the pending application, including any official notice. Instead, Applicant reserves the right to challenge any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action at any appropriate time in the future, should the need arise. Furthermore, to the extent that the Examiner has relied on any Official Notice, explicitly or implicitly, Applicant specifically requests that the Examiner provide references supporting the teachings officially noticed, as well as the required motivation or suggestion to combine the relied upon notice with the other art of record.

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at 801-533-9800.

Dated this 12th day of July, 2007.

Respectfully submitted,

/GREGORY R. LUNT/

RICK D. NYDEGGER
Registration No. 28,651
MICHAEL B. DODD
Registration No. 46,437
GREGORY R. LUNT
Registration No. 57,354
Attorneys for Applicant
Customer No. 47973

RDN:MBD:crb
CRB0000005174V001